DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 718 FL 014 574

AUTHOR Krasnick, Harry
TITLE Sheltered Subject-Matter Teaching and Second Language Acquisition in Private Schools for Foreign Students in Canada.
PUB DATE Jul 84
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Summer Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (6th, Corvallis, OR, July 13-14, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; Private Schools; *Program Design; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; Universities
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

Three program types for foreign student second language instruction in Canada involve sheltered subject-matter instruction at (1) a university, (2) a university adjunct or support program, and (3) a private "visa school" established solely to prepare foreign students for university or college entrance in Canada or the United States. The university-based programs represent the efforts of research- and practice-oriented academicians. The visa school does not result from any plan or method grounded in second language learning theory, and although it holds promise for language learning it may not achieve its potential. These schools offer an entire curriculum of sheltered subject-matter instruction, serve many good students, and occupy a strategic position as the first institution most foreign students have contact with in Canada. At the same time, they have a precarious, competitive existence and low social status, and are accountable to no permanent part of the local community. In this situation they cannot and do not implement program enhancements that would increase their instructional effectiveness. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248718

Sheltered Subject-Matter Teaching and Second Language Acquisition in Private Schools for Foreign Students in Canada

Presented at the Sixth Annual
TESOL Summer Meeting
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon
July 13-14, 1984

Harry Krasnick
Department of Language Education
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Harry Krasnick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL 014 574

My purpose in describing three somewhat unusual ESL environments where the input theory is useful for describing second language acquisition (SLA) is to illuminate or highlight the conditions that prevail at one of them, a type of school in Canada called a "visa school."

Two of the special environments are located at universities and represent the efforts of research- and practice-oriented academicians. The third environment, the visa school, is also rather special, but it does not result from any plan or method grounded in SLA theory. The visa school environment holds, I think, great promise--potentially--for SLA, but I suspect that it will not reach its potential. It is this paradox in which I am primarily interested.

The two university environments are the "sheltered subject-matter instruction" program at the University of Ottawa, in Canada, and the "adjunct model" used at UCLA and other schools. The "visa school" is what Canadians call privately operated schools established solely to assist overseas students in preparing for entrance into Canadian and American universities and colleges. These students are in Canada on student visas, hence the term visa student, and hence the term visa school.

So those are the three SLA environments--sheltered subject-matter instruction at a university, the adjunct or support program at a university, and the visa school. To start off, I will describe very briefly the general outline and philosophy of each program or environment, as preparation

for a more specific comparison which may shed some light on the visa school as a SLA environment. I may play fast and loose in my description of the university programs, but they have been adequately described already, both in journal articles and in TESOL presentations.

SHELTERED SUBJECT-MATTER INSTRUCTION

The sheltered subject-matter instruction approach to SLA is based on Krashen's position that SLA is the result of understanding language. He holds that "the subject-matter class is a language class if it is made comprehensible to the language student" (Krashen 1984: 62). The Ottawa experiment involves teaching second-semester Introductory Psychology in the students' second language (English or French) in a classroom where there are no students who are native speakers of the language of instruction--all the students, then, are in the same boat, and they need not compete with native speakers. These were intermediate-level second-language students, which corresponds with Krashen's notion that sheltered or modified language environments are the bridge between language classes and the real world.

It appears that during the 39 hours of instruction, the students improved their second language proficiency as much as their peers who took regular language classes; and they also learned psychology as well as students who took the regular psychology course.

The role of language teachers in the Ottawa program is limited to a 15-minute session during each of the two

90-minute weekly lectures. Grammar was not taught. The language teacher dealt with note-taking and provided a chance to discuss the content of the psychology course.

There were specific alterations and procedures in pedagogical technique, to accommodate the students' special language needs, but they will be discussed later. (The psychology instructor would also teach a section of psychology to students whose native language was the language of instruction, that is, a regular section.)

THE ADJUNCT MODEL

The adjunct model offers, in one version, a 6-week ESL (actually, EAP) program which is very closely coordinated with a subject-matter course which the ESL-speaking students are taking. The subject-matter course is not sheltered, that is, the ESL-speakers are mixed in with native speakers of the language of instruction, English. In the UCLA program, the language teacher takes a very active role, participating in 12-14 hours of instruction in ESL each week which included discussions related to the subject-matter course.

At UCLA, the students also receive substantial support in terms of study skills and academic counselling, in addition to discussions related to the subject matter. It happens that, as with the sheltered approach, the subject-matter course was psychology, in the case of the lower-ability ESL students.

Whereas the sheltered subject-matter program involved a total of only 39 hours of in-class instruction over the course of a semester, the UCLA adjunct program was quite demanding

for both students and staff (who must coordinate assignments in conjunction with other instructors as well as become somewhat familiar with the subject matter itself).

In the ESL classes, which amounted to about 14 hours per week, grammar was taught. Again, specific features of the program will be discussed a bit later.

THE "VISA SCHOOL"

The visa school typically offers a high school completion curriculum, usually including grades 11 and 12; an ESL program; and, increasingly often, first- and second-year university courses. All instruction is in English, and students may come from as many as 40 different countries, as with many ESL programs.

These schools are concentrated in Vancouver, British Columbia; and Toronto, Ontario. Visa students are not permitted to enroll in public schools in British Columbia, but they may in Ontario (and also Manitoba); what the situation is in the other provinces, I cannot say. It was estimated that there were about 2000 visa students in British Columbia in 1984, but that figure includes students already enrolled in universities as well as those in visa schools. In 1981, in Toronto, there were thought to be 5000 visa students enrolled in visa schools, and another 800 enrolled in the public and parochial school systems. We are speaking, then, of upwards of 6000 students when we speak of visa schools, and that figure may well be larger, in fact.

Visa schools are not regulated by the government or by any accrediting body (though an occasional one may qualify for provincial government certification, just as any private school may). Some are operated strictly as private businesses, while others are incorporated as non-profit institutions. A number of visa schools have gone bankrupt along the way. Enrollment at a visa school may range from 50 to 700. The schools receive no public funds (except for the odd local student), and are thus totally supported by tuition fees, which may range from $1000 to $2000 per trimester (multiply, currently, by about .78 to get the equivalent figure in American dollars). I know of no visa school which is the recipient of funds from foundations or other charitable bodies.

Overall, the schools have been a source of some embarrassment, and have been the subject of exposé-type newspaper articles--the country's leading newspaper ran a five-part series on visa schools in 1981--but for the foreign student in Canada who has not yet been accepted by a university, in many cases there is no alternative to the visa school.

The visa schools' high school diplomas are recognized by the provincial governments and by the universities, and many of the schools have a great preponderance of certified and graduate-degreed instructors. On the other hand, some of the ESL programs and some of the visa schools are staffed by rather underpaid (but dedicated) instructors, and Canada does not have the proportion of M.A.-in-ESL-holders that the United States does.

MAKING COMPARISONS AMONG THE THREE TYPES OF ENVIRONMENTS

One type of comparison involves demonstrated effects of the environment upon SLA. There are no data permitting direct comparisons, but, as noted earlier, the sheltered subject-matter instruction students did improve in their second language--while studying psychology--and they also reported feeling more confident using that second language, which is not really all that surprising.

In the adjunct program--according to a handout from a TESOL '84 presentation by Donna Brinton and Marguerite Ann Snow, which Ms. Brinton kindly sent me later--students definitely felt that the program--a Freshman Summer Program--helped them with their writing in general, and with their writing and reading with regard to the subject-matter course.

The strong support offered in that program certainly ought to have good effects, and student recognition of improvement ought to be expected as well. For the Ottawa program, succeeding in a university course in a second language likewise surely ought to improve one's confidence.

For the visa schools, the only data concerning SLA which I have come across have been some statistics unearthed by reporters from the Toronto Globe and Mail newspaper, which showed that visa students attending visa schools did significantly worse on the University of Toronto English placement test than visa students who had attended parochial high schools in the Toronto area. Twenty-three percent of the parochial school graduates failed, while 61 percent of the visa school

graduates failed.

As for affective variables--a major feature in Krashen's input theory--one factor which crops up again and again among all visa school students--those in ESL programs, and those in the academic programs--is a concern with the tuition costs, which are often greater than those of publicly-supported colleges and universities, in combination with some resentment directed at the school itself when and if it is perceived by the students to be a profit-making business (as, indeed, some of them are). Certainly visa students are beginning to realize that they can obtain equivalent ESL instruction at language schools at cheaper prices than some of the visa schools charge, and some of the visa schools themselves are competing for students by offering the lowest possible tuition fees. This is not to say that all visa students have negative feelings about SLA at visa schools, but they have become sophisticated consumers of private education in Canada.

Since specific or direct comparisons cannot be made among the three SLA environments, it will be useful to consider some of the more global or structural features.

SOME INPUT THEORY HYPOTHESES

In principle, the visa school should be an ideal SLA environment. This view is echoed by Krashen and Professor Wesche, of the University of Ottawa, both of whom recognize that foreign students are in need of a sheltered, transition environment. In effect, the visa school offers an entire sheltered

curriculum, since Canadian or anglophone students are comparatively rare, and indeed often absent, in visa school classes. In this sense, the visa school is similar to, say, a secondary-level immersion program in a second language. Moreover, since the subject-matter teachers are always teaching a great preponderance of ESL-speakers, coordination between them and the language teachers ought to be much easier.

I would like now to look more closely at some of the factors which may militate against the visa schools fulfilling their promise as SLA environments. I will deal with the questions of (a) affective filter, (b) monitor/grammar-teaching, and (c) comprehensible input.

THE AFFECTIVE FILTER

The affective filter, if its inhibitory effects on SLA are to be minimized, implies low anxiety, good motivation to acquire and use the langauge, and possibly the perception that others in the environment support that acquisition and use.

In the sheltered instruction approach, the exclusion of native speakers of the language of instruction contributes to low anxiety, and certainly the official bilingualism of Canada may do something to improve motivation to acquire the other official language (and, the University of Ottawa is a bilingual university). The language teacher offers some emotional support, too, through the twice-weekly meetings.

In the adjunct model, obviously the staff are spending great amounts of energy on supporting the students' progress, and the close coordination in writing assignments between

language class and subject-matter class would do much to reduce anxiety connected with using the second language in a natural environment.

In both university-based programs, then, students are "cradled," in that they see that the university has made special arrangements to offer them something tailored to their needs. Alienation, as a component of the affective filter, would thereby be minimized.

At the visa schools, however, a number of unhelpful conditions prevail. First, as mentioned, there is sometimes a broad-based distrust of the school itself, based in part on reports received before coming to Canada warning the student against getting "ripped off" by some of the less ethical visa schools.

Second, foreign students have very weak social networks in the community, in many cases (excepting the 'foreign student ghetto'), unlike the Ottawa students, for example, who would most often be citizens; and the adjunct-model students, many of whom are immigrants whose families are here, or "at risk" students who are, again, immigrants or citizens. The foreign students' families have high expectations, and this pressure is felt by the students. They worry about wasting their parents' money.

As visitors, foreign students do not expect to remain in Canada and continue using English. In many cases, English is merely the necessary evil involved in getting an education in Canada or the United States. It is a rare student who

truly seeks access to the English-speaking community. (This is most true of Asian students, as compared to, say, Iranian students, who, though they too are visa students, often have a more integrative type of motivation in learning English.)

In addition, there may be something which does deserve the name foreign student ghetto in which, for example, Chinese-speaking students live, with attendant negative reinforcement for any student whose English becomes "too good." Students living with relatives may be in a very similar situation, especially inasmuch as Canada, with its "cultural mosaic" approach, does not expect linguistic assimilation in the same way that it may occur in the United States. Many such students find themselves living in relatives' basements or attics for financial reasons, but whatever the basic motivation for such an arrangement, English as a foreign language may be a more appropriate model for thinking about the effect of the affective filter in second language acquisition.

There are two factors that have to do specifically with the visa school and its response to the visa students. The first has to do with programming. I know of no example where ESL classes are oriented to subject-matter classes which students are taking concurrently, even though many students are in a 50-50 situation, so to speak, for one or more semesters. There is no "outreach" on the school's part, to my knowledge, that is comparable to say, the adjunct model (even though in a majority of cases, probably, the academic use of ESL is stressed at least in matters such as choice of textbooks).

The other factor has to do with the institution's view of what English is. There seems to be an overemphasis on writing as a criterion for advancement in the ESL program, which may result both from ESL teachers' orientations as well as from some Asian students' culturally-based reluctance to engage in spontaneous oral discussion in class. The two tendencies, it would appear, are additive in their effect. The affective filter may be engaged when students who are actually fluent speakers of English as a second language are held back in the ESL program and/or prevented from taking subject-matter courses on account of writing problems alone (thus further depriving them, the input theory would say, of precisely what they need if their language development is to continue--input).

The reverse problem--students whose oral ability is far below their ability to read and write--may also engage the affective filter, for if it is accepted by the institution that communicating orally in English is not really necessary, can the student be expected to feel supported in acquiring English in a normal way? There is also the problem of the student emerging from a literacy-oriented ESL program into a subject-matter class where as much as 50% of the grade may depend on class participation!

GRAMMAR TEACHING AND THE MONITOR

As is well known, many foreign students approach English in terms of grammar, just as many of us did in preparing for foreign language examinations when we were seeking to demonstrate our 'research skills' as part of our graduate programs.

In the case of students who have studied grammar for many years without having "acquired" English, the issue is whether more grammar is what is needed. Much attention is being drawn lately to cultural differences in preferences for ESL study, and surely students, in many cases, feel totally "at sea" without reliance on grammar in their ESL instruction.

In Canada, the primary and secondary school immersion programs in French, and now the University of Ottawa experimental program, seem to be demonstrating that natural use of the language is what is needed, while the UCLA adjunct model retains grammar study as an essential component of the program.

The visa schools, too, tend to rely on grammar, but without the type of language-content integration found in the adjunct model. Teacher preparation is an issue here. At the post-secondary public institutions where ESL is taught, the proportion of instructors with graduate-level training is comparable to the proportion in the United States, generally speaking, but at the visa schools, it is not. No visa school offers salaries that compete with those found at the community colleges in Canada, and in fact some visa schools pay as little as CDN $12 per hour (about $9 in American funds).

Without the theoretical background and enthusiasm that tend to emerge from a master's program in ESL, where would teachers find the inspiration and the courage to even attempt the language-content integration found in the sheltered subject-matter and adjunct model approaches? And without

reasonable salaries and other forms of institutional support, where will the master's degree-holders come from?

COMPREHENSIBLE INPUT

Comprehensible input is at the heart of the immersion approaches, including the University of Ottawa experimental program. It does not play a part in any adjunct model where no adjustments in input are made in the subject-matter classroom.

A study at the University of Ottawa, as part of the experimental program, showed that there were individual differences between subject-matter teachers, which certainly limits the generalizations that can be made about sheltered subject-matter teaching at any institution. As it happened, the differences found between the anglophone and the francophone psychology instructor seemed to parallel cultural differences, at least in my understanding of the popular stereotypes:

> ...the French-speaking professor, whose highly planned, relatively formal presentations to both classes [that is, anglophone and francophone] in a logical manner, closely paralleling the sequence of content in the textbook and outline, made far fewer adjustments in her presentation to the L2 class, yet was easily understood because students knew what to expect. The English speaker in a more spontaneous, less formal, interactive presentation was prone to asides and deviations from the central theme. Perhaps this professor's adjustments at every level of the communicative system were a compensatory attempt to facilitate student understanding where they were less prepared to anticipate succeeding ideas (Wesche & Ready 1983: 23).

That study surveyed the adjustments made by these two university professors teaching their subject to second-language students. The professors, both of whom taught native speakers of the langauge of instruction as well, made the

typical adjustments in teaching the second-language students:

> slower rate of speech
> shorter clauses
> fewer words
> more pauses
> tendency toward more concrete vocabulary
> self-repetition or re-phrasing
> greater use of blackboards, gestures, intonation, schematic drawings

Changes over the course of the semester in the professors' approach suggested to the researchers that

> ...native speakers are able to make fine adjustments at many levels according to their perception of the effect on comprehensibility to non-native listeners of such factors as (1) newness and cultural or conceptual difficulty of content, and (2) students' L2 proficiency level according to initial perceptions and as amended through feedback (Wesche & Ready 1983: 23).

Adjustments in the syllabus included:

> ...more reliance on written outlines, emphasis on students' receptive language skills (listening and reading), and weekly short-answer quizzes on the psychology content instead of a research paper (Wesche 1984: 22).

The visa schools' subject-matter teachers tend to be those who cannot or prefer not to find employment in ordinary institutions. As such, they may have no special interest in teaching foreign students, although most of them, in my experience, do find that they like it, primarily because the students are clean, polite, middle-class, non-violent, respectful, and so on. And, of course, the intercultural aspect of the whole enterprise is attractive to many or most visa school teachers.

Still, some teachers come equipped with certain attitudes that militate against making the type of adjustments in

teaching that were found in the Ottawa program. Others simply have no idea of what would be most appropriate.

The mission of the visa school is to prepare students for university life, where presumably no accommodation of their needs will be made. Furthermore, the relatively low social status of the visa school itself in general creates in some teachers a concern with respectability (defined as receiving deferential or respectful behavior from others in the community). All this sometimes leads to a professed concern with "watering down" the content, or unduly "catering to" the students. It is actually felt by some that it would be doing the students a disservice to modify the teaching procedures to take account of the students' special language needs. Standards must be maintained, so to speak. This is the "sink-or-swim" attitude, and it leads to no accommodation whatsoever being made.

Various effects of this attitude can be noted. Talking to the class while facing the blackboard deprives the students of much-needed non-verbal information (the "i" in Krashen's "x + i" formulation of how progress is made). Lecturing while strolling about the classroom probably does, too. And basing a substantial portion of the final grade on oral participation in class is surely an example of non-accommodation, and in fact one which generally goes counter to the input theory. The often heard goal of 'getting the students talking' suggests an underlying theory that foreign students are similar to automobiles with dead batteries--a substantial push is what is needed to get the thing to commence operating properly.

On the other hand, most teachers do find themselves slowing down in their speech, repeating themselves, raising their voices, and so on--ordinary foreigner talk, in other words. What seems not to be appreciated, in addition to the need for verbal adjustments, is the need for non-verbal support, such as increased use of charts, diagrams, and so on. (It is all too easy to say that the student is supposed to be able to profit from the lecture, and if s/he cannot, then that is the ESL teachers' fault.)

But comprehensible input is only part of the picture in SLA--there must also be the opportunity to increase one's fluency, in the so-called real world. Otherwise, the student may reach, and remain at, a plateau. In the Ottawa and adjunct programs, and in fact in many programs, second language acquirers do indeed have opportunities, and needs, which involve using the second language for real purposes, in the real world. The visa school, unfortunately, affords comparatively little opportunity for contact with native speakers other than in-class input from the teacher, due to the factors mentioned earlier--most students speak ESL, some cultural norms against using English too well exist, students may live in a non-English-speaking home situation, Canadians are not always necessarily maximally encouraging of the students' efforts to speak English, students may not intend to remain in Canada, and so on.

How the visa schools can try to counter these problems is the last topic I want to address.

WHAT CAN THE VISA SCHOOLS DO?

One basic factor is the visa school's isolation, and its students' isolation. The visa school "business" is a competitive one, and any novel approach might backfire for other than pedagogical reasons, and so might be considered too risk-laden. For example, the number of hours of classroom instruction may be a potent factor in students' decisions as to which visa school to attend.

However, it seems that it would be possible to bring "real Canadians" to the students, especially in a province with an unemployment rate of about 14% (which is the case in British Columbia in 1984). If it is true that native speakers find out how to adjust their input to non-native speakers of English, then almost any well-intentioned, well-adjusted person could perform the function of providing input.

More specifically, it might be possible to hire university students to conduct after-school discussion groups with foreign students taking particular courses at the visa schools. Probably such individuals would not be as psychologically distant or even threatening as regular instructors. The visa school students would then have some of the benefits which accrue to the Ottawa experimental program students, who get 15 or 20 minutes of classroom-oriented discussion with a language teacher twice a week. And, undoubtedly visa school students could also receive something similar to the course-oriented writing instruction found in the adjunct model. (Ideally, the university students would be majoring in the subject area concerned.)

Taking such steps would require the visa schools to establish and maintain links with more respectable academic institutions in the community. And it would entail the implication that the visa schools could not in fact do everything necessary themselves--they would have to bring in outsiders. Of course, since other ESL programs are already operating on university campuses, this should not, in theory, involve any loss of face for the visa schools. It remains to be seen, however, whether the visa schools have the vision, and the resolve to mount such efforts, even if someone succeeds in bringing the idea to their attention. It is not likely that their own ESL instructors will recommend involving outsiders in the instructional process (remember that 14% unemployment rate!).

The other major item is the instructors' awareness of ESL-speakers' language needs. Each year literally hundreds of prospective ESL teachers complete the undergraduate ESL methods course and the associated introduction to linguistics for teachers course at the University of British Columbia, but these individuals do not seem to find their way into the visa schools as subject-matter teachers. Actually, since the ESL programs at the visa schools constitute only a small part of the instruction offered to ESL-speakers, it is the other instructors who should be taking the ESL methodology and linguistics courses.

Such courses, like most, can hope only to offer a broad introduction to the field. It is unlikely that they could devote much attention to the particular identified needs of

foreign students taking academic courses in ESL in Canada. On the other hand, the input theory as applied to sheltered subject-matter instruction could form the basis of a specialized ESL course to be taught on weekends, perhaps. Subject-matter teachers are not likely to offer to spend their leisure time learning things which they do not need to know, but it might be a different matter if an attempt were made to focus closely on the one thing they do that involves ESL-speakers.

In British Columbia, the local ESL association (British Columbia Teachers of English as an Additional Language--B.C. TEAL) has expressed some concern regarding the teaching of ESL at visa schools, so perhaps this would be a good project for them to get involved in.

In the alternative, the visa schools themselves, if they could organize for their common good as a group, could contract to have such a course offered. However, due to competitiveness (and concerns about social status) this does not seem very likely to happen.

THE PARADOX OF THE VISA SCHOOLS

It is certainly paradoxical that there exists a type of school which, of its very nature, offers an entire curriculum of sheltered subject-matter instruction, and serves thousands of the nicest, hardest-working students one could hope to find, and yet the potential to promote the language acquisition of its students goes almost totally unnoticed. The visa schools occupy a strategic position, in that they make it possible for

foreign students with linguistic or academic deficiencies to enter North American universities; indeed, they tend to be the first institution with which the foreign student has contact when coming to Canada. The opportunities are boundless, and there is a real challenge there.

At the same time, as mentioned, these schools have a precarious, competitive existence, and suffer from low social status. Such circumstances are not the type which would encourage the type of efforts I have recommended, unfortunately, and the students, at least while they are still newcomers, are not the type of individuals to demand changes, either (with a few exceptions). They have no spokespersons, and the visa schools are accountable to no permanent part of the local community. The governments have in effect refused to recognize the visa schools' existence as a unique type of institution which has a potentially very important role to play.

This I call the paradox of the visa schools.

SOURCES

Edwards, H., M. Wesche, S. Krashen, R. Clement, and B. Kruidenier. 1983. Second language acquisition through subject-matter learning: a study of sheltered psychology classes at the University of Ottawa. Centre for second language learning journal (University of Ottawa) (28), 29-54.

Krashen, S. 1984. Immersion: why it works and what it has taught us. Language and society (12), 61-64.

Krashen, S. and T. Terrell. 1983. The natural approach. Hayward, California: The Alemany Press.

Wesche, M. 1984. A promising experiment at Ottawa University. Language and society (12), 20-25.

Wesche, M. and D. Ready. 1983. Foreigner talk in the university classroom. Paper presented at the 10th University of Michigan Conference on Applied Linguistics, Ann Arbor, October, 1983. Forthcoming in Gass, S. and C. Madden (eds.), title T.B.A., Issues in second language research series. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.